REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 26, 2003 the Examiner noted that claims 1-31 were pending, and rejected claims 1-31. Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 24, 26-29 and 31 have been amended, claims 2, 16, 19, 21 and 30 have been canceled, new claim 32 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 3-15, 17, 18, 20, 22-29, 31 and 32 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claim 13 and indicated that the claim is objected to because a misspelled word. The spellings in claim 13 and other claims has been corrected and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 9-14, 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page U.S. Patent No. 6,285,999 in view of Mukai US. Patent No. 6,446,095. Page 6 of the Office Action rejects claims 2 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page, Mukai and Fujii US. Patent No. 6,144,973. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 6, 22, 23 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page, Mukai and Chong US. Patent No. 6,366,908. Page 9 of the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page, Mukai and Mighdoll US. Patent No. 6,505,232. Page 10 of the Office Action rejects claims 7, 8, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page, Mukai, Chong and Brown US. Patent No. 6,026,398. Page 12 of the Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kutoba US Patent No. 5,992, 737 and Page. Pages 13 and 14 of the Office Action reject claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kutoba and Fujii. Page 16 of the Office Action rejects claims 18-19 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Page in view of Logue et al. US. Patent No. 6,330,606.

Page discusses a prior art technique of ranking a document found in a search based on counting the backlinks or citations to the document (see col. 2, lines 20-25 and col. 4, lines 5-11). However, Page is directed to an improvement of this technique. The improved technique weights the backlinks from different pages differently and the number of links on a page is normalized (see col. 4, lines 12-37). That is, Page ranks documents based on a sophisticated way of counting links.

In contrast, the present invention has a document ranking that uses a similarity between the URL - Uniform/Universal Resource Locator (the characters of the URL) for the source URL

and the destination URL for the document. This is emphasized in independent claims 1, 15, 17, 18, 20, 29 and 31.

Mukai, as noted by the Examiner, analyses documents based on link information **"in"** documents (see col. 8, lines 48-49) and does not discuss ranking documents based link information to and from a document and particularity not based on character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Mukai adds nothing to Page with respect to this aspect of the present invention.

Fujii, as noted by the Examiner, determines a "similarity between document A and an ancestor document of document A". That is, Fujii compares the "contents" of the documents (see Abstract lines 8-9, col. 3, lines 4-7, col. 5, lines 16-17). Fujii does teach or discuss ranking documents based link information to and from a document and much less using character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Fujii adds nothing to Page and Mukai with respect to the above-discussed aspect of the present invention.

Chong, as noted by the Examiner, performs keyfact extraction and calculates keyfact frequencies for a document. A "keyfact" is different from a key word as particularly noted by Chong (see col. 1, line 15 - col. 2, line 7, particularly col. 1, lines 15-18). Chong does not mention ranking documents based link information to and from a document and particularity not based on character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Chong adds nothing to Page, Mukai and Fujii with respect to the above-discussed aspect of the present invention.

Mighdoll, as noted by the Examiner with respect to col. 2, lines 45-54, includes a server retrieved has a log-in service that accesses a database for access privileges for a user which privileged are transmitted to a client. This discusses nothing with respect to generating an access log or record of accesses as alleged by the Examiner. More importantly, Mighdoll does not teach or suggest that documents be ranked based on link information to and from a document and particularity not using character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Chong adds nothing to Page, Mukai, Fujii and Chong with respect to the above-discussed features of the present invention.

Brown uses specialized search terms called "Soundex" terms to search a database. Like the above discussed references, Brown does not discuss ranking documents based on link information to and from a document and particularity not using character similarity between

URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Brown adds nothing to Page, Mukai, Fujii, Chong and Mighdoll with respect to the above-discussed aspect of the present invention.

Kutoba is directed to a system that searches data for a specified character string. As in the references discussed above, Kutoba does not discuss ranking documents based on link information to and from a document and particularity not using character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Kutoba adds nothing to Page, Mukai, Fujii, Chong, Mighdoll and Brown with respect to the above-discussed aspect of the present invention.

Logue is directed to a proxy caching system that stores URLs of cached pages to allow the caching server to determine if a requested page is cached. Similar to the references discussed above, Logue does not discuss ranking documents based on link information to and from a document and particularity not using character similarity between URLs to and from a document as in the present invention. Logue adds nothing to Page, Mukai, Fujii, Chong, Mighdoll, Brown and Kutoba with respect to the above-discussed aspect of the present invention.

It is submitted that the present invention recited in independent claims 1, 15, 17, 18, 20, 29 and 31 is patentably distinct over the above discussed references. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 5 emphasizes that an access log is used to determine link importance. As noted above, Mighdoll and the other prior art does not address using an access log in determining link importance. As another example claim 4 emphasizes the similarity link importance and keyword frequency, and as noted above the prior art including Chong does not address this. Claim 24 emphasizes similarity link importance, access log and keyword frequency being used which is distinctive over Mighdoll and the other prior art. The other dependent claims also recite distinguishing features (for example, see the portion of a word being used for correlation). It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 32 emphasizes using URL similarity of to and from URLs of a document in determining link importance. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that the new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

12

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: ___6/26/13___   By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500